

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/803,841	03/18/2004	Rupert Pfaller	PFALLER ET AL -3 US	6430	
7590 10/20/2004			EXAMINER		
COLLARD & ROE, P.C.			VOGEL, NANCY S		
1077 Northern Boulevard Roslyn, NY 11576			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
11001,11,111			1636		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/803,841	PFALLER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nancy T. Vogel	1636 ·	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	1
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		•	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>-</u> ·		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan			
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		~	
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	Landin and American		
8) Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) \square objected to by the I	Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	lrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).	
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No.	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			
application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)	
2) 🔲 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5)	Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 1636

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-8, drawn to a method of producing a mutagenized *Sporidiobolus* ruineniae strain having Q10 productivity greater than 1.38 mg of Q10/g of dry biomass, classified in class 435, subclass 440 and 441.
- II. Claim 9, drawn to a mutated *Sporidiobolus ruineniae* strain having Q10 productivity of more than 1.38 mg of Q10/g of biomass, classified in class 435, subclass 254.1.
- III. Claims 10-13, drawn to a method for the production of Q10 comprising cultivating a *Sporidiobolus ruineniae* strain, classified in class 435, subclass 41.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of Group I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be isolated by screening naturally occurring strains.

Inventions of Group II and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1)

Art Unit: 1636

the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product, such as in a method of DNA hybridization, wherein the *Sporidiobolus ruineniae* is used as a source of DNA probes.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Further more, especially in instances where the classifications are the same, the non-patent literature searches required for each of these inventions are not co-extensive, hence said searches would be burdensome. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1636

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain

Art Unit: 1636

dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nancy T. Vogel whose telephone number is (571) 272-0780. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 - 3:00, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Irem Yucel, Ph.D. can be reached on (571) 272-0781. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Art Unit: 1636

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mr. T. Wyl Nancy T. Vogel, Ph.D. Patent Examiner